

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 3, 7, 18, and 19 have been amended to correct clerical errors. Claims 2 and 18 have been amended by replacing a recitation “pH 11” with “pH 4”. Claims 1, 2, 7, 18, and 19 have been amended by adding a new limitation. New Claims 25 and 26 have been added. Support for the amendment to Claims 1, 2, 7, 18, and 19 can be seen in Fig. 2, for example. Support for the amendment to Claim 2 and 18 can be seen in Claim 2 as originally presented. Support for the new claims can be seen in Claim 18 as currently presented, for example. Thus, no new matter has been issued. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and following remarks.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 2, 3, 7, 18, and 19 have been objected to because of informalities. Recitations “Poltol,” “measurement wavelengths,” “non-form,” and “700nm” have been replaced with “polyol,” “wavelength measurements,” “non-foam,” and “700 nm,” respectively, as instructed by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14-16, 18, 19, and 21-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103, as being unpatentable over Roberts. Although the Examiner acknowledges that Roberts does not disclose the claimed material, the material selection is considered to be routine experiment for person with ordinary skill in the art. Claims 1, 2, 7, 18, and 19, as amended herein, recites a new limitation “the light-transmitting region is in single layer structure...” On the other hand, the light transmitting region of Roberts is constructed in two layers, those are, the body (31) and anti-scattering layer (50). (column 3, line 20 & 48) Roberts requires the anti-scattering layer “to reduce the scattering of light by the roughened lower surface.” The present invention avoids the need for second layer and instead makes use of a material having a ΔT of 10 or less, wherein ΔT is as defined in the claims. As described in Applicant’s specification at page 12, lines 13-21, materials that satisfy the recited equation are durable to the acidic or aqueous solutions used in

polishing. Materials that do not meet the recited limitation exhibit deterioration that starts at the surface thereof. Thus, through the use of materials that meet the recited equation, the second layer of Roberts can be avoided and the recited single layer can be employed. The present claimed invention has made the prior art simpler without loss of capability. At least for this reason, Claims 1, 2, 7, 18, and 19 as well as the dependent claims, should not be rejected on this ground. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

New Claims

Roberts not only does not disclose the claimed material, but also fails to disclose material selecting criteria. The new claims positively recite the material selection step. Thus, for this additional reason, the claims are patentable.

CONCLUSION

In the light of the applicant's amendments to the claims and the foregoing Remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any remaining concerns which might prevent the prompt allowance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersign at the telephone number appearing below.

No Disclaimers or Disavowals

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, Applicant is not conceding in this application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that Applicant has made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

Application No.: 10/598,717
Filing Date: September 8, 2006

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: January 21, 2009

By:



Daniel E. Altman
Registration No. 34,115
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20995
(949) 760-0404

6453559_1
012109